Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

Claims 1-9, 13, 16-17, 18-20, 23, 47, 49-57, 61, 64-65, 66-68, and 71-72 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Hence, Claims 1-23, 47, and 49-72 are pending in the present application.

The issues raised in the final Office Action mailed May 25, 2010 and the Advisory Action mailed August 10, 2010 are addressed hereinafter.

I.   ISSUES RELATED TO THE CITED ART

A.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abrams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,675,350 ("ABRAMS") in view of Schaeck, U.S. Patent No. 7,502,833 ("SCHAECK"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Among other features, Claim 1 comprises the features of:

generating and storing a **mapping** that **maps one or more page parameter names** to **one or more portlet parameter names,** wherein **the mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with one or more page parameters that correspond to the one or more page parameter names;**
…;
in response to receiving the request to display the web page, performing the steps of:
  determining that the web page is associated with a **particular page parameter** that has a **particular page parameter name** from the one or more page parameter names;
  …;
  wherein **using the mapping** includes retrieving and **inspecting the mapping to determine that the particular page parameter name is mapped to a particular portlet parameter name that corresponds to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet;**
  …;
  passing a **value** associated with the **particular page parameter name** to the portlet **as a value of the particular portlet parameter** that corresponds to the **particular portlet parameter name;**

… .

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

It is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and SCHAECK do not describe the above features of Claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the invention recited therein involves mapping one set of parameter **names** (page parameter names) to another set of parameter **names** (portlet parameter names). This clearly distinguishes the claims from any implicit mapping that occurs when a value from a page is passed to a portlet. (The Applicants are not attempting to claim to be the first to pass a value from a page to a portlet).

It is true that when a value from a page is passed to a portlet, the value from the page is passed as an input parameter to some routine implemented by the portlet. It is also true that the input parameter would have a name, and that the name of the input parameter may be published to help pages interact with the portlet. However, that is not at all what Claim 1 is about. Rather, Claim 1 is about creating and using a mapping between the names of page parameters and the names of portlet parameters. Because of the mapping, a page does not need to know the name of the portlet parameter to which to send a particular value. Rather, using the page-parameter-name-to-portlet-parameter-name mapping, the correct portlet parameter of a portlet is identified **based on the page parameter name**.

This fundamental difference between the invention recited in Claim 1, and the art of record, results in several express limitations of Claim 1 that are not satisfied by the art of record, as shall be explained in greater detail hereafter.

With respect to the Advisory Action, it is respectfully noted that the Advisory Action raises a brand new argument. Specifically, in the second paragraph on page 2, the Advisory Action essentially argues that the Interface-Definition-Language (IDL) definitions, which are described in col. 2, lines 36-59 of SCHAECK, correspond to the mapping featured in Claim 1. This argument is factually and technology-wise incorrect.

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

First, even if a web service as described in col. 2, lines 9-59 of SCHAECK were to somehow be considered as equivalent to a portlet (SCHAECK itself clearly distinguishes web services from portlets), the IDL definition for such web service defines only the input/output data for the service. The web service itself, however, does <u>not</u> have any need to maintain an <u>external</u> mapping of its input parameters to any parameters associated with <u>web pages</u> (as featured in Claim 1). Rather, as suggested in col. 2, lines 9-59 of SCHAECK, such web service would have some executable code (e.g., a routine, a function, etc.) that accepts input data <u>values</u> that are received in a SOAP request message, and then uses these <u>values</u> to generate output data that the web service sends out in a SOAP response message.

Second, Claim 1 now expressly states that the mapping maps one or more **page parameter names** to one or more **portlet parameter <u>names</u>**, where the page parameter names correspond to page parameters that are associated with web pages, and the portlet parameter names correspond to portlet parameters that are associated with portlets. In other words, the mapping in Claim 1 is a **<u>name-to-name</u>** mapping. Fig. 1 as well as the rest of the present specification makes it clear that the mapping maps the **<u>names</u>** of page parameters to the **<u>names</u>** of portlet parameters, as opposed to mapping actual data <u>values</u> that could be assigned to such parameters.

As discussed above, the Advisory Action interprets the IDL definitions described in col. 2, lines 36-59 of SCHAECK as corresponding to the mapping of Claim 1. However, this interpretation of the IDL definitions is clearly not correct because an IDL definitions merely describe details (e.g., data types) for the input/output data required for a web service, but does <u>not</u> include and does <u>not</u> even need to include any mapping between the <u>variables</u> internally assigned by the executable code of the web service to such input/output data and the <u>names</u> of some parameters that are associated with <u>web pages</u> that may display results generated by such

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

web service. To the extent that the executable code of a portlet can send input data <u>values</u> to

such web service in a SOAP message, at most such executable code may have a hardcoded

association between a data value (e.g., such as a declared constant value) that can be sent as an

input to the web service and a variable that the executable code uses to place that data value into

the SOAP message. Significantly, however, such hardcoded association cannot possibly

correspond to the mapping of Claim 1 because such hardcoded association is at most a value-to-

variable mapping, while the mapping of Claim 1 is a name-to-name mapping.

Third, since ABRAMS does not describe the mapping of Claim 1 and since as discussed

above SCHAECK cannot possibly describe such a mapping, any combination of ABRAMS with

SCHAECK necessarily fails to describe such a mapping. Thus, ABRAMS and SCHAECK

cannot possibly describe any functionalities that are performed based such a mapping. In

contrast, with respect to a request to display a web page, Claim 1 includes the features of:

wherein using the mapping includes retrieving and inspecting the mapping to determine that the

particular page parameter name is mapped to a particular portlet parameter name that

corresponds to a particular portlet parameter of a portlet; passing a value associated with the

particular page parameter name to the portlet as a value of the particular portlet parameter that

corresponds to the particular portlet parameter name. These features of Claim 1 indicate that the

page parameter names and the portlet parameter names included in the mapping are used to

dynamically determine which page parameters correspond to which portlet parameters and to

pass values associated with the page parameters as values of the portlet parameters of a portlet

that generates a component of the web page.

Finally, it is noted that Claim 1 includes one or more additional features that are not

described by ABRAMS and/or SCHAECK. For example, the final Office Action uses a

combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK to allege a prior disclosure of several features of

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the allegation in the final Office Action and the assertions in the Advisory Action, the combination of the teachings of ABRAMS and SCHAECK does not describe or suggest these features of Claim 1. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that ABRAMS and SCHAECK whether taken alone or in combination do not describe or suggest all features of Claim 1. Thus, Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

B.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

Claim 18 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 includes features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above. For example, among other features Claim 18 comprises:

> generating and storing a **first mapping** that **maps** one or more events to one or more actions and **one or more event output parameter names** to **one or more page parameter names, wherein the first mapping is stored separate from web pages associated with one or more page parameters that correspond to the one or more page parameter names**;
> …;
> retrieving and inspecting the first mapping, wherein **inspecting the first mapping** includes:
> determining, based on the first mapping and the intercepted data, an action to perform in response to the particular event;
> **based on the first mapping, determining that an event output parameter name, which corresponds to an event output parameter associated with the particular event, is mapped to a particular page parameter name**; and
> causing the action to be performed, wherein **causing the action to be performed** comprises **passing a value associated with the event output parameter name as the value of a particular page parameter that corresponds to the particular page parameter name**;
> … .

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

It is respectfully submitted that at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1, ABRAMS and SCHAECK do not describe or suggest the above features of Claim 18.

Further, Claim 18 includes one or more additional features that are not described by ABRAMS and/or SCHAECK. For example, the final Office Action uses a combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK to allege a prior disclosure of several features of Claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that, contrary to the allegation in the final Office Action and the assertions in the Advisory Action, the combination of the teachings of ABRAMS and SCHAECK does not describe or suggest these features of Claim 18. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 18 is respectfully requested.

C.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 49

Claim 49 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK.

Claim 49 includes features similar to the features of Claim 1 discussed above, except in the context of a computer-readable medium. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 49 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 49 is respectfully requested.

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

D.   INDEPENDENT CLAIM 66

Claim 66 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over

ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK.

Claim 66 includes features similar to the features of Claim 18 discussed above, except in

the context of a computer-readable medium. For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that

Claim 66 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK for at

least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the

rejection of Claim 66 is respectfully requested.

E.   DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, AND 67-72

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 13-14, 16-17, 19-22, 50-51, 53-62, 64-65, and 67-72 were rejected as

allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK. Claims

4 and 52 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in

view of SCHAECK, and further in view of Hind et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

US 2004/0205555 ("HIND"). Claims 6, 9-12, 23, and 47 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of SCHAECK, and further in view of Polizzi

et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0052954 ("POLIZZI"). Claims 15 and

63 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over ABRAMS in view of

SCHAECK, and further in view of Katariya et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,251 ("KATARIYA").

Each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 depends directly or indirectly from one

of independent Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66, and thus includes each and every feature of the

independent base claim. Furthermore, in rejecting Claims 4, 6, 9-12, 15, 23, 47, 52, and 63 the

Office Action relies explicitly on ABRAMS and SCHAECK, and not on HIND, POLIZZI, or

KATARIYA, to show the features discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66.

Because ABRAMS and SCHAECK do not teach the subject matter of Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66,

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

any combination of ABRAMS and SCHAECK with the other three references necessarily fails to teach the complete combination recited in any dependent claim of Claims 1, 18, 49, or 66. Thus, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 is allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66.

In addition, each of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 introduces one or more additional features that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 1, 18, 49, and 66. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2-17, 19-23, 47, 50-65, and 67-72 is respectfully requested.

II.   CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the final Office Action and in the Advisory Action have been addressed. Further, for the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the RCE filed concurrently herewith and reconsideration of the present application are respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Ser. No. 10/600,284 filed 06/20/2003
Burns et al – GAU 2178 (Tsui)
Amendment and Reply with RCE

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: September 26, 2010   /StoychoDDraganoff#56181/_____
                                    Stoycho D. Draganoff
                                    Reg. No. 56,181

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California   95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 208
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076